

February 21, 2003

Ms. Dorcas A. Green Walsh, Anderson, Brown, Schulze & Aldridge, P.C. P. O. Box 2156 Austin, Texas 78768

OR2003-1150

Dear Ms. Green:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 177046.

The Hays Consolidated Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for the "name, policy information and contact information for the District's liability insurance carrier for coverage of matters such as those alleged by Mrs. Spencer." You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. See Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that person may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note that the district only submitted a document entitled "Coverage Document" to us for our review. The requestor specifically requested all "policy information" from the district. You do not indicate that you have released any portion of the requested information to the requestor. Therefore, we assume that the submitted "Coverage Document" is the only information that the district maintains that is responsive to the request. However, to the extent that the district maintains other information that would be responsive to this request, the district must now provide the requestor with such information. See Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .022(a)(3) (stating that information in contract relating to expenditure of public or other funds by governmental body is public unless expressly confidential under other law), .301, .302.

Next, we address your section 552.103 claim with respect to the submitted information. Section 552.103 provides in pertinent part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

. . . .

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code, § 552.103(a), (c). The district maintains the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the governmental body receives the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. See University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found., 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.--Austin 1997, no pet.); see also Heard v. Houston Post Co., 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The district must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

A governmental body must provide this office with "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture," when establishing that litigation is reasonably anticipated. See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. See Open Records

¹ In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, see Open Records Decision

Decision Nos. 555 (1990), 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. See Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).

Based on our review of your arguments and all of the information that you submitted to us for review, we find that the district has established through concrete evidence that litigation was reasonably anticipated by the district on the date that it received the request. In addition, we find that the district has established that the submitted information is related to that reasonably anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, we conclude that the district may withhold the submitted information pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.²

However, we note that once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. See Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and may not be withheld from disclosure on that basis. Further, we note that the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. See Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); see also Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, to the extent that the district maintains other information that would be responsive to this request, the district must now provide the requestor with such information. The district may withhold the submitted information pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.

No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, see Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

² Because we base our ruling on section 552.103, we need not address your remaining claim regarding section 552.101 of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

Ms. Dorcas A. Green - Page 5

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

Ronald J. Bounds

Assistant Attorney General

Open Records Division

Rosel J. Bourds

RJB/lmt

Ref: ID# 177046

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. J. Stephen Spencer

P.O. Box 1034

Dripping Springs, Texas 78620-1034

(w/o enclosures)